

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

The Declaration was indicated defective. Applicant is obtaining a new Declaration and will submit the Declaration upon execution.

Claims 1 and 12 were objected to and have been amended in a non-narrowing manner to address the items raised by the Examiner.

Claims 5, 8, 10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and have been amended in a non-narrowing manner to address the items raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1-8, 11 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Sun. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "said call facility first attempting an audio connection to the host party and making an audio connection to the at least one participant after the host party has answered the audio connection." Support for this feature is found on at least page 8, lines 4-17 of Applicant's specification. Wu fails to teach this feature.]

Wu teaches that invitations are sent to potential participants in a conference and the responses to the invitations are collected. The teleconference server collects the positive responses and generates a control script for the telephone conference (see column 10, lines 27-43). When the teleconference is initiated, the telephone conference server initiates calls to selected participants and the coordinator (see column 10, lines 44-53). Wu fails to teach initiating a call to the coordinator first and then initiating calls to participants if the coordinator answers as recited in claim 1. Sun was relied upon for disclosing a bridging facility for bridging audio connections between the host party and participants. Sun, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu discussed above.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Wu in view of Sun. Claims 2-8 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Wu in view of Sun for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Claims 19-24 include features similar to those

discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over Wu in view of Sun for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Claims 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Sun and Doganata. Doganata was relied upon for disclosing a host destination being an Internet Protocol address. Doganata, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Wu discussed above. Thus, claims 9-10 are patentable over Wu in view of Sun and Doganata for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: March 30, 2004